

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for allegedly not showing the second rib as claimed in claim 2. Applicants submit that the second rib of claim 2, where the second rib includes two rib members, is shown in the drawings. For example, FIG. 9 illustrates two second rib members 40a and 40b.

Claim objections

Claims 1-15 were objected to for informalities. With respect to repeating the word “is” in claim 8, claim 8 has been amended to delete one of the occurrences of “is”. With respect to the use of “slid” in the claims, applicants submit that the use is proper. The “slid member” in the claims is a member which is slid, and thus the use of “slid” is proper. The term “sled” instead of “slid” as suggested in the Office Action would not be proper, because the member which is slid is not a sled, nor is it moved as a sled.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 have been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0163204 to Singleton, Jr. et al. (“Singleton”). Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,981,011 to Lombardo (“Lombardo”). Claims 8 and 9 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton in view of U.S. RE No. 37,190 to Stowell et al. ("Stowell"). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,556,668 to Chun ("Chun"). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0061997 to Skinner, Jr. et al. ("Skinner"). Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,580,107 to Howell ("Howell"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

An electronic apparatus, comprising:

a first housing;

a second housing connected to the first housing, the second housing rotating between a closed position to be superposed on the first housing, and an open position to expose the first housing, and having a front wall, a rear wall and an upper wall, said upper wall being exposed even if the second housing is in the closed position;

a latch which mechanically connects the second housing to the first housing in the closed position, *the latch has a slid member slidably mounted on the upper wall*, the slid member having an outer surface with a first rib which is arranged on the outer surface, extended in the direction crossing the sliding direction of the slid member; and

a second rib arranged in one of (a) on said slid member, (b) on said upper wall, or (c) on said rear wall, said second rib extending in the direction crossing a second housing rotating direction,

wherein the second housing rotating direction is perpendicular to the sliding direction.

Singleton, upon which all the rejections are based, at least in part, does not disclose at least the above italicized features of claim 1, where the second housing rotating direction is perpendicular to the sliding direction of the slid member.

Singleton discloses a computing unit 5 with a latching device 10 coupled to hooks 15, which insert into receptacle 20 when the cover 25 of the unit 5 is rotated to a closed position. FIG. 3 of Singleton shows a grip 30 of the latching device with ridge 45 and periphery 40.

Singleton, however, fails to disclose any slid member of its latch 10 where the slid member has a sliding direction perpendicular to the cover 25 rotating direction. The latching device 10 does not function such that a slid member has a sliding direction perpendicular to the cover rotating direction. As can be seen from FIG. 2 of Singleton, the latch 10 is pushed down such that the hooks 15 rotate to engage with the receptacle 20. Singleton does not have a slid member as recited in claim 1.

The remaining references were cited for other features of the claims, but fail to suggest that Singleton should be modified to include a slid member as specifically recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 5 and 14 also recite “wherein the second housing rotating direction is perpendicular to the sliding direction” of the slid member, and thus are patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Moreover the orientation of the second ribs in independent claims 1 and 5 provide advantages for the structure of those claims where the slid member sliding direction is perpendicular to the second housing rotating direction. Because the second housing rotating direction is perpendicular to the slid member sliding direction, moving the slid member in the sliding direction itself is not sufficient for opening the second housing. Additionally, a user opens the second housing by pushing it in the rotating direction with the slid member after the slid member is slid. Since the operation of sliding the slid member and pushing up the second housing is made at the same time by a user applying a force to the slid member, the orientation of the second rib (extending in a direction crossing the second housing rotation direction in claims 1 and 5) provided on the slid member is important for the user to open the second housing easily. The references applied in the rejection of the claims do not suggest

this combination of features and fail to realize the advantages resulting therefrom in allowing for easy opening of the second housing.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

April 11, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 945-6162

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Pavan K. Agarwal Reg. No. 40,888



Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888